

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/808,797	SINGH, GUNJEET	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Fred I. Ehichioya	2162	

All Participants:

(1) Fred I. Ehichioya.

(2) Christian A. Nicholes (Reg. No. 50,266).

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 23 April 2007

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1 - 25

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Fred Ehichioya
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner discussed with applicant's representative (Mr. Nicholes) that due to the addition of new claim 25, there exists a restriction in the current application. The claims are restricted into two groups. Group I consists on claims 1 - 24, disclosing a utility that exports one or more transportable tablespaces, one or more database objects that are associated with an identifier in a database and classified in class 707 subclass 205 (file allocation) while Gropu II consists of claim 25 and discloses plurality of ad-on programs that cause data to be stored, retrieved, and modified in a database and classified in 707 subclass 4 (query formulation and input preparation). Mr. Nicholes choose to prosecution Group II by examiner's amendment. Examiner also suggested to Mr. Nicholes on April 25, 2007 that amendment to claim 25 is needed by adding a computer system and a processor to the caim to specify that the claim is a hardware and not software per se in case this claim is approved for allowance. Mr. Nicholes also approved examiner's amendment to this effect..